

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-59340

Title: LYRICIST TO THE AIRWAVES: A CRITICAL STUDY OF INDIRA BORO'S ESSAY
"MY JOURNEY TO ALL INDIA RADIO, GUWAHATI".

Rating

Recommendation: acceptance after minor revision.

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality		☑		
Techn. Quality			☑	
Clarity		☑		
Significance		☑		

Reviewer's ID: JPR- 212

Detailed Reviewer's Report

Summary

This qualitative textual study examines Indira Boro's autobiographical essay "My Journey to All India Radio, Guwahati" (2024). It traces her evolution from radio listener to lyricist, announcer, and cultural contributor, and discusses radio's role in promoting Bodo language, literature, and culture. The study uses text analysis and a biographical method.

Assessment

Originality: Good

The study addresses an under-researched area—Bodo broadcasting history and women's participation in regional radio. Boro's narrative offers a valuable personal account of cultural production through electronic media.

Technical Quality: Fair

The textual analysis is generally sound, but the methodology is thinly described, the findings section largely summarises rather than critically analyses, and the study lacks engagement with broader theoretical frameworks on autobiography, media, or cultural memory.

REVIEWER'S REPORT**Clarity: Good**

The manuscript is organised logically and reads clearly. However, there is repetition across sections, and some paragraphs are overly descriptive.

****Significance: Good****

The study contributes to Bodo literary and cultural history and highlights radio's role in regional language preservation. It is useful for scholars of media, autobiography, and Northeast Indian literature.

Key Strengths

- Original focus on Bodo radio broadcasting and a woman lyricist's trajectory
- Clear narrative structure following Boro's journey from listener to creator
- Useful documentation of AIR Guwahati's cultural role
- Relevant to regional literary and media history

Key Weaknesses

1. Methodology underdeveloped — No explanation of analytical framework, coding, or how conclusions were derived from the text.
2. Descriptive rather than critical Much of the paper summarises Boro's essay instead of critically analysing it.
3. No engagement with theory — Autobiography, cultural memory, and media studies concepts are mentioned but not theorised.
4. Biographical method undefined The paper claims a biographical method but does not explain or justify it.
5. Repetition Key points (radio's influence, listener-to-creator transition) are repeated across sections.
6. Language and proofreading issues Frequent grammatical errors (e.g., "He was introduced" for Boro; "his new career" for a female subject; inconsistent tenses).
7. Gender analysis underdeveloped Boro's experience as the only woman in her training batch is noted but not analysed.
8. No limitations or positionality statement The author's relationship to Boro or the text is not disclosed.

REVIEWER'S REPORT

9. References Some references appear unrelated to the study (e.g., Culler, Hudson, Rajimwale) and are not cited in the text.
10. No critical discussion The study does not compare Boro's account with other Bodo broadcasters or evaluate the reliability of autobiographical memory.

Recommendations

Decision: Minor Revisions

1. Strengthen the methodology section with a clear analytical framework.
2. Move beyond summary to critical analysis of the essay's themes and narrative strategies.
3. Engage with relevant theory (autobiography, cultural memory, media and identity).
4. Correct all grammatical errors, especially pronoun inconsistencies.
5. Reduce repetition across sections.
6. Add a brief discussion of gender and women's participation in broadcasting.
7. Remove uncited or irrelevant references; ensure all citations match the text.
8. Add a short limitations note and author positionality statement.

-Confidential Comments to the Editor

This is a useful contribution on a neglected topic—Bodo broadcasting and women's creative participation. The narrative is engaging, but the paper reads more as a descriptive appreciation than a critical study. Minor revisions focused on methodology, critical depth, and language would significantly improve it. I recommend **acceptance after minor revision**.